



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

knows better than to give to the intelligent readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW blinding, hateful, warped falsehoods.

JOHN MCF. HOWIE.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

[Houston Stewart Chamberlain married a daughter of Richard Wagner, who, though not a brewer, contributed handsomely to one of the two best of Germany's products—her music and her beer.

—EDITOR.]

SIR,—I dare say you like to hear from your readers. The present July number is an excellent one. I find five very interesting articles therein in addition to the introductory editorial, namely, (1) "The Impassable Chasm"; (2) "Selling Arms to the Allies"; (3) "The Dangers of Pacifism"; (4) "The New English Cabinet"; and (5) "Mr. Wilson's Cabinet."

May I ask why you admitted Mr. Chamberlain's article, "England"? It seems to me to be entirely superficial and rubbishy. In places it is childish. The question, "Who has not heard of Warren Hastings?" (p. 49) sounds like an expression from a school boy's declamation. It is certainly amusing to be told by the writer (pp. 42-43) that his ideas concerning English liberty are founded on his experience when a youth, in an election row in a country town. From this rumpus he learned more than "through all my subsequent studies of the works of Hallam and Gneist." He dignifies this shindy by the name "phenomenon," and traces it back to the Norman invasion of 1066, an event which he says destroyed the fine civilization of the period in England, and finally resulted—horrible thought—in the thumping of Mr. Chamberlain eight hundred years afterward. The article is a nasty, abusive, slanderous and ridiculous production from which nothing of value can be learned by any one.

In hopes that a reader's protest against the publication of such rubbish may have some value, I send you this.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED B. CRUIKSHANK.

SIR,—I have always thought very highly of your magazine. It is one of the best we have. But the article on "England" by Mr. Chamberlain was more fit to be published in one of the Hearst papers than in such a high-class publication as yours. Your readers cannot gain anything by the perusal of such stuff, and your excellent periodical loses much in prestige by publishing it. Couldn't you put your hands upon some real scholar to write on the subject?

H. MICHAELYAN.

FAR ROCKAWAY, N. Y.

[THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW is a forum. Mr. Chamberlain's well-earned position as an historian entitled him to a hearing. If he was as unconvincing as our correspondents imply, is it not probable that the effect of his dissertation was the reverse of that striven for?

—EDITOR.]

AN ENGLISH CHAMPION OF GERMANY

SIR,—I picked up a copy of the REVIEW the other day, after an abstinence of some months, and I see you have not yet perceived the error of your ways.

Perhaps my mental development is not up to the high standard of pro-British sympathizers, but I confess I cannot understand the line of reasoning which you permit to hold sway in your magazine, viz:

Before August, 1914, Germany was looked to as a leader in science, art, music, drama, philosophy, medicine, education, pedagogy, municipal government, national government, mining and metallurgy—Berlin was freely admitted to be the choice city of the world for residence, the ne plus ultra of civilization.

Since August, 1914, we are informed that Germany is ignorant, low, mean, cruel, insane, diseased, uncivilized, crazy, mad, deluded, maniacal, selfish, *and* (oh, the humor of it!) that "she never did lead the world in the arts of civilization, anyhow."

How comes it that these weaknesses of Germany have just come to light?

I hold it as a self-evident truth that the intelligence, the sanity, the philosophy, the brilliance and the kindness of the great German heart remains the same to-day in spite of the efforts of British pens. The nation is not a criminal, in my eyes, because it has pulled John Bull's whiskers.

One thing more: I dislike to see you intimate so frequently that this country is pro-British in sympathy. This country is *pro-German*—*pro-German* spite of "women and children" sobsters, spite of British pens—spite of the *British gold* invested in our industries. If you do not believe it, step on a street car to-night, and, without intimating your own strong bias, start up a talk on the war with the common man on your bench. You will find him *against* the British!

One more point: The sympathizers with Germany are not confined to "those of German descent," as you intimate. I'm English.

And another—this country was not a "unit in wrath" at the sinking of the *Lusitania*. About half of us (myself, too), while regretting the occurrence, thought *the Kaiser did right*. One man (English name) said, "If my own mother had gone down on that boat I still would have said, 'They had a right to do it.'"

ALBERT S. HORN.

SWISSVALE, PA.

[Although we have never used the words attributed to us by Mr. Horn, we readily concede that a mighty change in the opinion of the civilized world respecting Germany has been wrought by her barbarous conduct since July of last year. But we cannot argue with one who insists that "the Kaiser did right" when he deliberately assassinated hundreds of unoffending and helpless men, women and children whose right to be where they were was absolute. Nor do we care to comment upon the filial attitude of the person quoted.

—EDITOR.]

TYPHOID IN THE BRITISH ARMY

SIR,—I was very much interested in your paragraph on "Health." I think you will be interested in the following three statements as to typhoid fever in armies:

In the Boer War, in an army averaging 208,326 men, there were 57,884 cases of typhoid with 8022 deaths. The Boers only killed 7791.